

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Restriction Requirement dated May 31, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 30, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 remain pending following entry of this response. Claim 8 has been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 1-23 stand restricted under 35 U.S.C. 121 as follows:

- I. Claims 1 - 6 and 11 - 15, drawn to composing a document, classified in class 715, subclass 530.
- II. Claims 7 -10 and 16 -19, drawn to Interface Customization, classified in class 715, subclass 744.
- III. Claims 20 - 23, drawn to Modifying a Mark-up Language User Interface, classified in class 715, subclass 760.

Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, the claims of Group I (Claims 1 - 6 and 11- 15). Applicants point out that Examiner has not restricted the claims in Group I from the claims in Group III (Claims 20-23). Therefore, Applicants request that the claims of Groups I and III be examined together.

Applicants further submit that the claims of Group II are not patentably distinct from the claims of Group III. Two criteria must be satisfied for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (A) The inventions must be independent; and (B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required. (MPEP § 803). Applicants submit that the Examiner has not properly established or satisfied the criteria for a proper requirement for restriction.

Examiner states that:

“Inventions III and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as allowing a user to custom design his own version of an electronic document using a user interface for easier and faster customization.”

However, Applicants point out that the claims in Group III would allow a user to custom design his own version of an electronic document using a user interface for easier and faster customization.

Therefore, the claims in Groups II and III are not subcombinations of one another having separate utility. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is improper.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Restriction Requirement, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan

Registration No. 44,227

Registration No. 43,876

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicants